

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/980,199	03/08/2002	Detlev Neuland	3868-0104P	9426
2292	7590 12/17/2004		EXAM	INER
BIRCH STE PO BOX 747	WART KOLASCH	HAMILTON, ISAAC N		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/980,199	NEULAND ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Isaac N Hamilton	3724		
The MAILING DATE of this communicati Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a retion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT y statute, cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed  (30) days will be considered timely.  HS from the mailing date of this communication.  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	04 August 2004.			
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐	his action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice up	•	• •		
Disposition of Claims		•		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 7-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 7-12 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from consideration.			
Application Papers	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to b	y the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection	• • •	` · ·		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the of the first transfer of the sheet (s) including the of the first transfer of the sheet (s) including the of the sheet (s) include				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	•		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. Iments have been received in Ap e priority documents have been re Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage		
Attachment(s)	_ '			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94)		mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date		
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S   Paper No(s)/Mail Date		ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 09/980,199

Art Unit: 3724

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In light of the specification and drawings it is not clear how the vacuum conveyor channels function to allow the strips to lead together at the end of the channel. It is not clear how plates 13 and 14 create a vacuum channel, nor is it clear how the strips are lead together at the end of the channel because Figure 3 clearly shows the strips together at the beginning of the channel.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 7-9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ring (5,374,042) in view of Faasse, Jr. (4,556,441), and further in view of Pohjola (5,224,405) and Bakker (5,193,423). Ring discloses a broad web of sheet-like material 10; multiple circular

Application/Control Number: 09/980,199

Art Unit: 3724

knife roll 56, 52, 50, 54; turned by about 90 degrees on its way to conveyor channel in figure 1; strip 16 turns 90 degrees upward immediately after being cut from strip 18; strip 18 turns 90 degrees downward immediately after being cut from strip 18; strips are lead on top of each other in figure 1 adjacent element 68. Ring does not disclose manufacturing a medicinal and/or any active substance containing product, a roll on a take-up mandrel, a vacuum roll, or a vacuum conveyor channel. Faasse, Jr. teaches manufacturing medicinal and/or any active substance containing product in figure 10. It would have been obvious to provide manufacturing a medicinal and/or any active substance containing product in Ring as taught by Faasse, Jr. in order to apply web separator and deflector technology to a wide range of products. Note in Faasse, Jr. roll 54; take-up mandrel in figure 1 at the center of roll 54; medicinal substance containing products in column 2, lines 25-48; dermal patches in column 1, lines 9-15; active substance containing sheet-like administration forms in column 1, lines 56-68. Pohjola teaches a vacuum roll 32. It would have been obvious to provide a vacuum anvil roll in the combination of Ring and Faasse, Jr. in order to replace the tractor feed devices 36 in Ring so that the apparatus can convey various web structures. Bakker teaches vacuum conveyor channel 21. It would have been obvious to provide a vacuum conveyor channel in the combination of Ring and Faasse, Jr. in order to replace the tractor feeder 70 in Ring so that the apparatus can convey various web structures.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ring, Faasse, Jr., Pohjola and Bakker, as applied to claims 7-9, 11 and 12 above, and further in view of Mlodozeniec et al (4,349,531), hereafter Mlodozeniec. The combination discloses everything as noted above, but does not disclose administration forms for oral application.

Application/Control Number: 09/980,199

Art Unit: 3724

However, Mlodozeniec teaches administration form for oral application in column 3, lines 40-44. It would have been obvious to provide application forms for oral application in the combination as taught by Mlodozeniec in order to provide various products to consumers.

### Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac Hamilton whose telephone number is 571-272-4509. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday between 8am and 5pm. If attempts to

Art Unit: 3724

reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 571-272-4514.

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9306.

1 1/

ΙH

December 13, 2004

BOYER ASHLEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER